

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is filed in response to the final Office Action mailed June 21, 2010. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 5, 14-15, 25-26, 36-37, 39-41, 43 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,549,650 to Ishikawa et al. (“*Ishikawa*”) in view of publication “A Stitching Algorithm of Still Pictures with Camera Translation,” Proc of the First International Symposium on Cyber Worlds (CW’02), 2002, IEEE (“*Yang*”). Claim 4 has been rejected 1-3, 5-8, 10, 14-19, 21, 25-30, 32, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* in further view of U.S. Patent 6,445,293 to Alonso (“*Alonso*”). Claims 6-8, 10, 17-19, 21, 28-30, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* in further view of U.S. Patent 7,307,654 to Chang (“*Chang*”). Claims 11, 13, 22, 24, 33, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* and *Chang* and in further view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2003/0071906 to Matsumoto (“*Matsumoto*”). Claims 12, 23, and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*, *Chang*, and *Matsumoto* and in further view of *Alonso*. Finally, Claims 38, 42, 44, and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* in further view of U.S. Patent 5,731,846 to Kreitman (“*Kreitman*”). For the Examiner’s reference, Claims 3, 9, 16, 20, 27, and 31 were previously canceled and Claims 1, 14, 25, and 36 have been amended. Thus, as a result of this Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21-26, 28-30, and 32-46 are currently pending in the application for the Examiner’s consideration.

Examiner Interview

An interview with the Examiner and the Examiner’s supervisor was conducted on September 16, 2010. During the interview, the Examiner, the Examiner’s supervisor, and Applicants’ attorney discussed the rejection of the independent claims based on *Ishikawa* and *Yang*. The Examiner’s supervisor acknowledged that proposed claim amendments presented by

the Applicants' attorney during the interview would overcome the cited art. In addition, the Examiner's supervisor advised Applicants' attorney that the proposed amendment would be accepted in an after final Amendment. Accordingly, the claim amendments presented with respect to the independent claims in this response reflect the proposed claim amendments made during the interview.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*. Although Applicants do not agree with the current rejection of Claim 1, in order to expedite prosecution of the current application, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to further clarify the claimed invention over the cited art. For example, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite the step of calculating a projective transform for pixels of the images from at least one of said cameras based on slopes and positions of said corresponding lines, which said projective transform compensates for the relative rotation between the at least two video cameras. Support for this step may be found the discussion of equations III and IV on page 9 and page 14, lines 30-31 of the as-filed application. Applicants respectfully submit (and as acknowledged in the interview) that the portions of *Ishikawa* and *Yang* cited in the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest at least this step recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of Claim 1 under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, and 37-40

Dependent Claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, and 37-40 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* and various combinations of *Alonso*, *Chang*, *Matsumoto*, and *Kreitman*. Claims 2, 4-8, 10-13, and 37-40 depend from independent Claim 1 and therefore include all of the elements of Claim 1 plus additional elements that further define the invention over the cited art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claim 1 and in light of the additional elements that further define the invention, Applicants

respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejections of these claims under § 103(a).

Independent Claim 14

Independent Claim 14 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*. Applicants have amended Claim 14 to recite a processor configured to calculate a projective transform for pixels of the images from at least one of said cameras based on slopes and positions of said corresponding lines, which said projective transform compensates for the relative rotation between the at least two video cameras. As discussed above in support of Claim 1, the portions of *Ishikawa* and *Yang* cited in the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest a processor with at least this feature. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 14 is patentable over *Ishikawa* and *Yang* and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of this claim under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 15, 17-19, 21-24, and 41-42

Claims 15, 17-19, 21-24, and 41-42 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* and various combinations of *Alonso*, *Chang*, *Matsumoto*, and *Kreitman*. Claims 15, 17-19, 21-24, and 41-42 depend from independent Claim 14 and therefore include all of the elements of Claim 14 plus additional elements that further define the invention over the cited art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claim 14 and in light of the additional elements that further define the invention over the cited art, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejections of these claims under § 103(a).

Independent Claim 25

Independent Claim 25 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*. Applicants have amended Claim 25 to recite computer-readable program code portions comprising executable portions that cause a device to calculate a projective transform for pixels of the images from at least one of said cameras based on slopes and positions of said

corresponding lines, which said projective transform compensates for the relative rotation between the at least two video cameras. As discussed above in support of Claim 1, the portions of *Ishikawa* and *Yang* cited in the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest executable portions with at least this feature. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 25 is patentable over *Ishikawa* and *Yang* and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of this claim under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 26, 28-30, 32-35, and 43-44

Claims 26, 28-30, 32-35, and 43-44 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* and various combinations of *Alonso*, *Chang*, *Matsumoto*, and *Kreitman*. Claims 26, 28-30, 32-35, and 43-44 depend from independent Claim 25 and therefore include all of the elements of Claim 25 plus additional elements that further define the invention over the cited art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claim 25 and in light of the additional elements that further define the invention, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejections of these claims under § 103(a).

Independent Claim 36

Independent Claim 36 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*. Applicants have amended Claim 36 to recite a memory storage area storing a program for calculating a projective transform for pixels of the images from at least one of said cameras based on slopes and positions of said corresponding lines, which said projective transform compensates for the relative rotation between the at least two video cameras. As discussed above in support of Claim 1, the portions of *Ishikawa* and *Yang* cited in the Office Action fail to disclose or suggest a program with at least this feature. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 36 is patentable over *Ishikawa* and *Yang* and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejection of this claim under § 103(a).

Dependent Claims 45 and 46

Claim 45 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang*. Claim 46 has been rejected as being unpatentable over *Ishikawa* in view of *Yang* and *Kreitman*. Claims 45 and 46 depend from independent Claim 36 and therefore include all of the elements of Claim 36 plus additional elements that further define the invention over the cited art. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above in regard to independent Claim 36 and in light of the additional elements that further define the invention, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the current rejections of these claims under § 103(a).

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the final Office Action mailed June 21, 2010. The foregoing amendments and remarks are believed to have placed the present application in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at (404) 881-7640 or e-mail at chris.haggerty@alston.com to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

The patentability of the independent claims has been argued as set forth above and thus Applicants will not take this opportunity to argue the merits of the rejection with regard to each dependent claim. However, Applicants do not concede that the dependent claims are not independently patentable and reserve the right to argue the patentability of the dependent claims at a later date if necessary.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher S. Haggerty/

Christopher S. Haggerty
Registration No. 58,100

CUSTOMER NO. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2010.